THE

MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. III.] BOSTON, MARCH, 1862. [No. 3.

TWO WAYS IN RELIGION.

A Letter to Rev. F. D. HUNTINGTON, D.D., Rector of Emmanuel Church, Boston.

DEAR SIR, — When I saw your tract with the title, "Two Ways in Religion," I hoped that it might contain some original and striking views bearing on the religious condition of our community. Having been so long a Unitarian minister, and being now a Trinitarian minister, I trusted that you would show us how we could retain all the truth and good of the first, and yet add to it some special good derived from the second. I hoped you would show that you had lost nothing of the freedom of thought and moral earnestness belonging to the Unitarian body, while adding to it the deeper piety and more living faith claimed for themselves by Trinitarians. A man that has seen *both* sides ought to know more than *either* party who has seen only his own. He should realize in himself what the poet desires: —

> "Keeping the old with truth to the end,
> Taking in the new like a welcome friend," —

he should be able to help both forward by seeing further than either. *Such* change is progress. But he who has to throw away all his past, in order to get any thing from the future, is no better than a child, who, with a handful of apples, drops one while trying to get another. Such change is the oscillation of the pendulum, not the progress of the man.

The title of your tract also interested me, — "Two Ways in Religion." It touched a subject I had long deemed important. I hoped now to see a full discussion of it. There *are* "two ways in religion," and, as I think, *only* two ways that deserve to be called so. That is, there are two ways which men, equally serious, conscientious, and earnest, may feel bound to take. These are the way of Truth and the way of Good. One man says, "I will seek first for Truth; for whatever is true will certainly do good." The other says, "I will seek first for Good; for whatever does good must be true." Both these principles seem sound; and yet it is evident that both may be carried too far, and pursued too exclusively. The one, pursued exclusively, may make me a *fanatic:* the other, pursued in the same way, may make me a *Jesuit.*

If I say, "Whatever is true will do good; and therefore I will follow truth (or what seems to me to be truth), regardless of consequences; I will not care, though I seem to be doing harm; I will sacrifice all apparent expediency to my principle; I will carry out my idea, though in doing it I break the hearts of those I love, shock the feelings of the community, overturn the foundations of society, and shake the most holy institutions," — then I may become a fanatic. And what has cursed mankind more than fanaticism? Certainly truth must always, in the long-run, do good. But what *I* think to be truth may not always turn out to be so. I may be mistaken; and therefore, when

what I think truth seems to be doing harm, I am bound to wait, to revise my investigation, and re-examine my facts and my inferences.

On the other hand, if I say, "Whatever does good must be true; and therefore I will accept, without criticism or examination, every doctrine and creed which seems to have borne and to bear good fruits; I will shut my eyes, repress my doubts, stifle all questions, and follow blindly the good men whom I see at work; I will make utility the standard, and call every doctrine true which piety and benevolence assert to be so," — then I grow false in my inner soul. I put error for truth, and darkness for light. I refuse the light God sends, and which he means me to receive. I take away the key of knowledge, and make progress impossible; for all progress must come from new sights of truth which God sends to his children. I must also call things true, when I do not *see* them to be so, because I choose to do it. I therefore virtually "tell lies for God." I become a Jesuit, and corrupt morality and religion at their very centre.

This is the real question in religion. It is is not a question as between sects and parties, but as between antagonist tendencies of character. Some people are made to lay more stress on truth than on good: others are made with an opposite tendency of soul. Different churches, it is true, like different individuals, lean in the one direction or the other. Roman Catholics usually love Good more than Truth, and so tend to Jesuitism. The Jesuits may be driven out of the Roman Church; but they return again, and once more become the leading order, because they represent most fully the general tendency of the Catholic community. On the other hand, the Protestant Church, as a whole, loves Truth more than Good, and so tends to fanaticism. Fanatical parties, fanatical minds, pushing

doctrines to extreme results, are always the leading parties and men in Protestant communities.

Nevertheless, the question I have stated is one which divides individuals as well as sects. It has been said that every man who thinks is born either a Platonist or an Aristotelian. So, likewise, every religious man is born with a leaning either to use or to conviction.

The importance of the question shows itself at the very beginning of the religious life. The soul longing for God asks, "What shall I first do? what shall I first seek? Shall I begin with the heart, or the life? Shall I do good that I may become good? or shall I become good that I may do good? Shall I ascend from morality to piety, or descend from piety to morality? — begin with faith, and go to works? or begin with works, and go to faith? Shall I improve myself that I may do good to others? or do good to others that I may thereby grow better myself? Shall I join the Church, and use its outward means of prayer, sacraments, and the like, that I may get a new heart? or strive for a new heart that my prayers and works may be really religious and not empty forms? Shall I reform my conduct, that God may forgive me? or shall I seek and find God's forgiving love, that, in the joy of that forgiveness, I may render him a truer service? O Dr. Huntington! if you had, in an earnest and candid spirit, and with the genius God has given you, helped us to the solution of *these questions*, what ineffable good might you not have done! — for these are the questions which knock at the doors of our hearts and at the doors of the Church. The Age, greatest of reformers, has nailed these theses on the doors of the Church of our day, on *this Eve of All Souls;* for we have reached the Feast of All Souls, — the days in which the reverence due to every soul of man begins to be realized. These are the questions which must be answered.

Unfortunately, you have not attempted the solution of them, but have gone back to discussions of much less interest and value. I shall not be doing you injustice, I suppose, in saying that it is the object of your tract, "Two Ways in Religion," to show that the religious system of Unitarians is wrong, and that of Trinitarians right. It is true that you do not name Unitarians; but you mean to be understood as pointing at them. I do not think that any thing is gained by this reticence. It is no worse to be called by name than to be pointed at with the finger. The object of your tract is to show that Unitarianism is all wrong, and Trinitarianism all right: and as it is said that ladies sometimes put the most important part of their letter in the postscript; so, perhaps, one purpose of the tract is conveyed on the last page but two, where you describe the pre-eminent excellences of the particular sect to which you at present adhere.

Now, I do not say that there is any thing improper in this purpose. Much as I wish that you might have dedicated your powers and used your position in a more essential discussion, I admit it was natural for you, and not wrong, to entertain this one. Believing Trinitarianism the one thing needful, it was natural for you to try to make others believe it too. Thinking that men are to be saved by moving out of one system of doctrine into another, out of one church into another, it was natural to endeavor to make them do this. Besides, it was very natural that you should wish, in leaving the denomination you once served for a new one, to try to bring over some of your old friends with you. Ambition is not quite extinguished, even in the bosom of saints; and a deserting general, who comes over attended with followers, is much more welcome than one who comes alone.

But one is sorry to see a mind and heart like yours give

up to party what was meant for mankind. You were sent into the world to make converts to God, not proselytes to a creed or a sect; and I must indeed believe, that, in your pulpit and parochial labors, you usually have a higher object than appears in this tract.

Yet I do not propose to contradict all the charges you bring against Unitarian doctrines and methods. I am a Unitarian, on full conviction; and see no probability of ever being changed. You cannot make a Trinitarian of me by your arguments; for, though a Unitarian, I believe in the true Trinity quite as much as you do. In fact, your Trinity, compared with mine, seems to be very indistinct and vague, — fading away into a colored fog of rhetoric. You cannot convince me of the Deity of Christ; for I see as much of God in Christ as you seem able to show me. You present me a doctrine, when I already have the reality. You beg, with tears, that I would accept a certain formal statement *about* Christ, when he has long been to me the sacred channel through which God descends into my heart.

But, though a Unitarian, I see many faults in Unitarianism, and am glad to have them pointed out. I welcome any just criticism you may be disposed to make on our shortcomings. It is very desirable to see our faults and errors; and he is our best friend who points them out. Past and present Unitarianism is very open to criticism. I, at least (forgive the egotism which an epistolary style induces), have always felt the jejune character of much in our writings, and the want of depth in many of our statements. In my early youth, Priestley and Belsham were my aversion; Coleridge and Jeremy Taylor, my masters. Such sincere writers as Channing, Walker, and Henry Ware, have, indeed, been very dear to me; but not more so than such earnest writers as Bushnell, Beecher, and

Robertson. Like yourself, I have gone as far as Romanism for helps in piety; and, for systematic study of doctrine, have looked as well to Aquinas as to Schleiermacher. Especially do I turn and return to the Apostle Paul, to Augustine, and to Luther, for my best religious insight and suggestion. The doctrine of justification by faith seems to me as to them, and has so seemed for twenty years, the article of a standing or falling church.

Why then, you may say, with these leanings towards Orthodoxy, do you not follow my example, and accept some Orthodox creed, and join some Orthodox communion? Shall I tell you the truth, dear brother? It is because I do not see Christ among you so plainly as I see him where I am. It is because you give me the shell instead of the kernel, the form instead of the substance, a profession instead of a conviction, an outward assent instead of an inward reality. I want to *see* God manifest in the flesh; and, instead, you present me with some theory about him. I wish to feel the love of my dying Saviour, and you proffer me a cold doctrine of the atonement. What I long for and pray for, daily, is a greater access to Christ, — my Master, my Saviour. Help me to this, O my brother! and I will bless you for ever. But it grieves and chills my heart to find, that, instead of this, you are merely laboring, with intense energy, to build up a party and strengthen a creed, — "compassing sea and land to make one proselyte."

Examine yourself, and see if it is not so. Suspend, for a few days, this whirlwind of exciting labor; make a Catholic "retreat;" go into your closet with your Master alone; and then, in his presence, ask yourself whether your real aim is to make proselytes to a party, or to make converts to God.

I ask you to do this in the interest of your own soul, and

the interest of Christ and his church, not in that of Unitarianism. You had better not return, under any circumstances, to the Unitarians. You never belonged among them, and never could feel at home among them. "Friend, go up higher." Go to a higher plane than that of any sect or party, whether Liberal or Orthodox. Be not a Churchman, but a Christian. Build with the gold, silver, and precious stones of solid spiritual truth; not with the wood, hay, and stubble of formalism, ritualism, literalism, and dogmatism. So shall you be blessed in the last day by the Master, — your Master and mine, — whose words are spirit and life.

It is very painful to see one, who has been face to face with the grand future of Christianity, turn back to its past. All signs indicate the coming of the Son of man to establish a new church, which shall include all the good of all the old ones. Your tract seems to say that you have no faith in any such coming. You accept all the old doctrines, and all the old forms, as though they could "make the comers thereunto perfect." You admit, indeed (p. 9), that the language used by the Orthodox is sometimes a little artificial, and might be improved; but you do not say that any point of Orthodox doctrine can be regarded as capable of improvement. As it stands in the creeds manufactured by uninspired men two or three hundred years ago, so let it stand for ever. You do not believe in "the bringing-in of any better hope" than that furnished us by John Calvin on the one hand, and Archbishop Laud on the other. We are to swallow, without hesitation, the old draught of doctrine against which our fathers protested, argued, and triumphantly contended. We are invited to take on our shoulders the very same yoke which they were unable to bear. It is not to be loosened or lightened in any particular.

But this position of yours seems to me to imply a want of faith in Divine Providence. Was it only human will, in your opinion, or only blind chance, which caused the rational movement in New England? Do you think that God, without whom not a sparrow falls, permitted for no good end, and for no just cause, such a great movement of the human mind? Had he nothing to do with the raising-up of those great and good men who have left on everlasting record their solemn protests against the doctrines of Orthodoxy? Was it without any reason, that Channing and Ware, and all their brethren, became dissenters from the ancient creeds of Christendom? I cannot read history so. Granted, that their protest may have had also its defects and imperfections. I must still believe that God sent them to do a work, and helped them in the doing of it; and that we, their children, instead of ignobly abandoning all that they have contended for, should, with careful and conscientious thought, hold fast to their truth, while we admit their error: otherwise, all they have done becomes vain through our weakness and wilfulness.

In all discussions concerning theology, two principles are to be maintained. First, that all systems, widely received and long retained, must have a substantial element of truth. Doctrines which have been held by the majority of the Church during many centuries, as important to their life, cannot be wholly false. Hence we may safely assume, that in the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Trinity, Total Depravity, &c., there is some essential truth. But, secondly, every doctrine, which, though widely received and long retained, has constantly excited the opposition of intelligent and conscientious persons, must contain some error of statement. Substantially true, it must be formally false. All such doctrines, therefore, need a re-examination and a restatement. But this is the case

with the Trinity and its affiliated doctrines. They have constantly excited the opposition, not of the ignorant, irreligious, and vicious, but of the most pure, conscientious, and intelligent minds. They have tormented some; they have alienated others; they have driven tens of thousands away from God and from Christ; they have been the fruitful mothers of infidelity, indifference, and despair.

Hence it was, that the Unitarian reform became necessary. If it fails of its work, — if it is defeated by Orthodox opposition, — another more terrible and sweeping reform will take its place. Orthodox doctrines can only be maintained by being improved. In their past and present form, their reputation has been fatally damaged: they have been proved irrational, unscriptural, and irreligious. It is not by a change of language that they can be rehabilitated in the faith of mankind. Not by means of a handsome rhetoric are they to be made acceptable; for the fault is not in their rhetoric, but in their logic. They may be disguised in cloudy veils of sentiment, or borne forward in a swift current of eloquence: but at last men ask the fatal question, "*What do you mean by all this?*" and then all the old defects re-appear.

We charge against the Church doctrine of the Trinity, that it is, —

1. Unscriptural.
2. Unintelligible or irrational.

That it is unscriptural, appears plainly enough. Not only the words "Trinity," "Triune God," "God the Son," "God the Holy Ghost," "Threefold Personality," &c., are nowhere found in Scripture, but the idea of the Trinity is not found there. It is nowhere stated, in any kind of language, that there are three persons, three hypostases, three distinctions, three any things, in the Divine Nature. The nearest approach which can be found to a statement of

the Trinity are these: (1.) The baptismal formula, where the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are mentioned. But it is not said, in this verse, that the Son and Holy Spirit are Divine Persons; nor is it said that the three make one God. (2.) The apostolic benediction, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. In this, again, Jesus Christ, God, and the Holy Ghost, are mentioned together; that is all. (3.) The three witnesses, 1 John v. 7. But no scholar, at the present time, would quote this passage in support of any thing.

The doctrine of the Trinity is therefore unscriptural. It does not, indeed, follow from this, that it is not true: but it follows, that it is not an essential doctrine; for, if the New Testament is a *revelation*, it must certainly reveal somewhere, in plain language, every thing essential to man's religious life.

We object, again, to the Trinity, that it is either unintelligible, or, if intelligible, irrational. The Church, and you yourself, usually prefer to take the first horn of the dilemma. Occasionally, some honest and daring, but incautious spirit, like H. W. Beecher, takes the other side, and teaches plainly a Trinity of three Gods. But the Church usually declares the doctrine a mystery; that is, an unintelligible doctrine.

Then we say, If unintelligible, it is incredible. We cannot believe a doctrine which we cannot understand.

To this you reply (following the beaten track), by telling us, through five or six pages, that we believe many things which we do not understand; that is, — as you adroitly explain, changing the issue, — of which our "understanding is unable to take in all that they seem to signify." Of course we do; but, my dear Dr. Huntington, this is not the point. It is not necessary to argue with us, through so many pages, to convince us of that.

The point is, that, though we believe many facts and

doctrines which fade away into mystery, *it is always the intelligible part which we believe, never the unintelligible.* Our belief goes just as far as our intelligence: when our intelligence stops, our belief stops with it.

Take your own illustrations, and you will see the truth of this. You say (pp. 12 and 13) that we do not understand how the mind acts on the body, so as to produce the motion of the arm or foot. I reply, that, consequently, we do not believe any thing as to the way in which the mind acts on the body.

You say that we, nevertheless, believe the fact, that the mind does act on the body. I reply, The fact *that it does* is perfectly intelligible, and therefore we believe it.

What we believe, therefore, is the *fact*, which is intelligible: what we do not believe is the *mode*, which is unintelligible.

You say, again, that we do not know what brings a tree from an acorn. What is light? Why do different substances reflect different rays of light? I reply, that, consequently, we have no belief in regard to these things. We do not believe any thing about the cause of growth in an acorn, about the nature of light, or the cause of reflections. What we believe is the perfectly intelligible and comprehensible statement, that an acorn grows, that light exists, that substances reflect it.

It is almost time, one would think, for grave divines and teachers to cease from sophisticating themselves and others by such very simple fallacies as these. We have all our life been hearing learned doctors defend the Trinity by saying, "You do not understand how a blade of grass grows, and yet you believe it." And we have been all our life replying, "The statement, that a blade of grass grows, is a perfectly intelligible statement, and we therefore can believe it: the manner in which it grows is unintelligible, and therefore we do not believe it."

I assert, Dr. Huntington, — and shall be glad to maintain the position against any thing you are able to write or to say, in public conference or in private conversation, — that it is not in the power of the human mind to believe an unintelligible proposition; that any proposition is unintelligible, if any essential term of it is unintelligible; and that the Church Trinity, as usually taught, and as taught by yourself, is such an unintelligible, and consequently incredible, proposition.

Nor do I believe that it is a religious act, or that it promotes reverence for God and his word, to teach that he has revealed an important doctrine in such a way that it is unintelligible to the human intellect.

Passing by all this, however, for want of space, and because we have already discussed it in other places, I come to another of your assertions, in regard to the doctrine of the Atonement.

You say (p. 27), "Careful thought will disclose weighty reasons why our violations of God's plain and holy law should not be pardoned simply on repentance and amendment. That does not honor his law. Even human governments could not be administered on a principle so lax as that. A strange law that would be, which every subject might violate at his pleasure, without punishment, without any suffering anywhere set over against the crime; all obligation and penalty being immediately discharged when the criminal should begin to be sorry for his sin, and turn from it! Any sound judge or statesman would tell you, that, on such a principle, a government would be impossible;" &c.

Now, in my judgment, "careful thought" shows no such principle as is here laid down, but just the opposite.

Many years since, an Episcopal minister, of great piety and active goodness, said to the writer, "I have been

teaching, all my life, that it would not do for God to forgive sin on the simple condition of repentance and amendment; and, to my great surprise, I found, last week, that he actually *did* that which I have asserted he could not do. I had asserted, that to promise pardon on the simple condition of repentance, without the atonement, would make men think lightly of sin. But I chanced to open my Bible at Ezek. xviii. 21, 22; and I found that God, by his prophet, did actually offer pardon on those very terms. Nothing is there said of an atonement; nothing could be known of it by the sinner. I was amazed at the error in which I had continued so long; in which I had been instructed so carefully, and had instructed others."

Do you mean to teach, Dr. Huntington, that the Prophet Ezekiel did not honor the law, when he taught, that, if the "wicked man turned from his wickedness," he "should save his soul alive"? — "Ah!" you say, "he had a foresight of Christ's atonement." Suppose he had (of which we have no evidence): *he says nothing about it to his hearers;* and it is the bad effect of the doctrine on them which you assert.

You call this principle, announced by God through his Prophet Ezekiel, and taught again by Jesus in the parable of the Prodigal Son, "a lax principle" of government. Why "lax"? Because it makes forgiveness too easy. But I do not see how it is any easier for the sinner, on our ground (that is, the ground laid down by Ezekiel), than it is on yours. We say to a man, "If you commit sin, you shall be forgiven, on the condition of repentance and reformation." You say to him, "If you commit sin, you shall be forgiven, on the condition of repentance, reformation, and belief in the atonement." How is one any easier than the other? Why is the one doctrine, in its practical influence on the world, any more lax than the other? If a

man was about to commit a sin, because he knew he could be forgiven for it on subsequent repentance and reformation, would he be deterred from it by being told, that, in addition, he would be obliged to believe in the atonement? And, if not, how is our doctrine more lax than yours?

You say, my dear brother, that no human government could be conducted on our basis. Could it be conducted any more easily on yours? According to your principle, the method would be, not to have the criminal punished, but to have him told that some one else had been punished in his place already. Suppose the Legislature of Massachusetts should enact that no punishment hereafter should be inflicted on any criminal who should repent, but that some one else should suffer in his place: would it be so *very easy* to conduct a human government on *this* Orthodox principle? I do not think that "any sound judge or statesman" would say so. Governing human States on the principles of Calvinism would not be any easier than governing them on the principle of the parable of the Prodigal Son.

You say that this principle of pardoning on the ground of repentance "does not honor the law." This also I have heard said a hundred times; but I shall hear it said a hundred times more without believing it. "Careful thought" shows me, that in no way can God's law be *so* honored as by the sincere repentance of the sinner, by his confession, and amendment of life. All true repentance includes confession and amendment. If all the sinners in the universe should repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance, would not that honor God's law? If all the devils in hell should, with one accord, lay down their rebellious arms, and confess their sin, would it be no honor to the divine law? Punishment does not honor the law half so much as repentance. Even the laws of a human State

would not be so much honored in that State, if half the citizens were rebelling against them, and kept forcibly in prison, as though they should all, of one accord, begin to obey them. Which would most honor the United-States Union and Constitution, — for the rebellious States to be conquered, and held by force of arms; or to have them return voluntarily to their obedience? Certainly, the last. In fact, punishment does not always honor the law at all: it sometimes merely honors the power of the government. Any *strong* government can punish those who disobey its mandates; but such punishment does not honor the law, but often disgraces it. Punishment, in itself, has not any power of making law honorable. It may cause it to be outwardly obeyed, while inwardly it is hated. But repentance and confession are the best and fullest testimony that can be borne to the justice and righteousness of a law.

Indeed, if human courts had the power which God has, of reading hearts, they also might forgive, as God does, on the simple condition of repentance; only punishing, as God does, those who persist in sinning. There could not be any greater safety for society, than for all criminals to be converted into good men. Nor is it true, that "all punishment and suffering" is done away thus; for "there is no peace to the wicked." While we sin, we must always suffer.

I think that you have sometimes deceived yourself in the haste of argument. You often shift the issue in a way which would be sophistical if done intentionally, but, being done carelessly, is only fallacious. You tell us (p. 33), "You say that it is enough to preach a morality and piety which excludes the ideas of a triune God, an atoning sacrifice for the pardon of sin, and a gracious renewal and sanctification by the personal act of the Holy Ghost. We make our reply by putting into your hands the Bible. That

is our charter; that is our authority: we have no other." But now it happens that there is nothing in the Bible, from one end to the other, about "a triune God," "an atoning sacrifice," or "a personal act of the Holy Ghost." None of these terms are there. If then, as you say, you have no authority but the Bible, *where do you get these terms?*

Directly, you go on thus: "If you still venture to say that these terms — 'justified by faith,' 'the grace of Christ,' 'pardon and peace by the cross,' 'atonement,' 'remission of sins' — are strange and useless, we can only bid you pause once more, and listen," &c.

But, Dr. Huntington, how did you contrive to substitute these scriptural terms, which we *do* accept and believe and use, for those others, which are not scriptural, and which we reject? By what adroit "prestidigitation" do you substitute "justified by faith" for "triune God," and "the grace of Christ" for "an atoning sacrifice"? Do not we, as well as you, teach the "grace of Christ"? Do not we hold to the doctrine of "justification by faith"? Surely we do. Did not you, during the long years that you were a Unitarian minister, ever preach of "justification by faith," or of "the grace of Christ"? If you did not, you differed therein very much from many of your brethren. We do not preach as often on these terms as some others; but we mean to give them their proper place in the right division of the word of truth.

I observe that you are not accurate in your quotations from Scripture. I have noticed the following misquotations in your tract: —

(1.) Page 8, you have this passage, all in quotation-marks, as from the Bible: "There is an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve only this tabernacle of

the moral law." The text is Heb. xiii. 10; and the words, "of the moral law," are added by yourself, you also changing "the" into "this." You may thus mislead your readers by making them suppose that "the tabernacle" means the moral law; which meaning is only your own "private interpretation."

(2.) On the same page, you have, in quotation-marks, the words, "What shall I do to be saved, with this great salvation?" There is no such passage in Scripture.

(3.) On page 25, you say of Christ, that he absolutely affirms that he has "all power, both in heaven and earth." The word "both" you have inserted. Moreover, Christ does not say (Matt. xxviii. 18) that he has "all power," &c.; but says, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." You have mutilated the text by leaving out of it the very essential words, "IS GIVEN UNTO ME." You have taken them out, and closed up the words before and after them in your quotation, without any indication of the omission. Now, you put your tract into the hands of young people, and of others not acquainted with the details of Scripture language; and by this omission you may persuade them, that the text, in which Christ declares that *all the power he has is derived power*, proves him to be God. My brother, is not this handling the word of God improperly? This text, as it stands in Matthew, is a perfect proof that Christ is *not* God: for it asserts that *all the power he has* is derived; and it therefore proves him to be a dependent being. But, by your method of quotation, a passage in which Jesus carefully teaches his dependent and derived character is made by you to teach just the contrary.

(4.) Page 26, you say that an evangelist expressly asserts that Christ, the Word, was, "in the beginning, with

God, and was God." You have here put together, as one quotation, parts of two verses, or else have omitted a part of one. The passage, properly quoted, would have shown, that, while the apostle said that "the Word" was God, he did not say that Christ was the Word. This is an assumption of your own. The passage does not teach that Christ is God; but it teaches that "the Word," which is God speaking, was in nature, in the soul, and lastly in Jesus Christ. This is consistent: but, according to your view of the passage, the apostle asserts, in the first verse, that Christ is God; and, in the eighteenth, declares that "no man hath seen God at any time." But as he himself, and thousands more, *had seen Christ*, it is evident that he did *not* mean to say that Christ was God.

(5.) Page 26, you say, "Jesus himself said he was before Abraham, — the 'I AM.'"

But, in my copy of the Bible, it is not so written. Jesus does not say, "Before Abraham was, *I am the I AM;*" but simply, "Before Abraham was, *I am*,"— meaning, no doubt, "I am the Messiah." I say, *no doubt;* because that which Abraham saw was the "day" of Christ, — that is, the Messianic time. This he saw in prophetic vision; and he *could* see it, because, before he was born, Jesus was ordained in the Divine Counsel to be the Messiah. The text, therefore, must mean that Jesus was appointed to be the Messiah before the time of Abraham, because such fore-ordination would explain how Abraham could see his day; but his pre-existence before Abraham, either as God or in any other way, would not explain it.

(6.) Pages 30 and 31, there is a long quotation from the Epistle to the Ephesians, from which several lines are omitted, without any notice of the omission. Your quotation, commencing Eph. ii. 12, goes on at ver. 14 thus: "For

he is our peace, who hath abolished in his flesh the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace, and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross. For through him we both have access by one spirit unto the Father." In this quotation, you omit the following passages after the word "peace." You omit, "who hath *made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having*," &c. Again: after the word "flesh," you omit, "*the enmity;*" and, after the word "cross," you omit, "*having slain the enmity thereby; and came, and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.*" Why you have made these omissions seems to be the fact, that the passages omitted show the apostle was speaking of an atonement between Jew and Gentile accompanying the reconciliation of both to God. The "peace" is between Jew and Gentile, and the enmity slain by Christ's cross is the enmity between Jew and Gentile. (See Locke and Olshausen on the passages. Both these commentators — one a Unitarian, and the other Orthodox — refer this atonement to the reconciliation between Jew and Gentile by the abolition of the ceremonial law.)

It may, perhaps, be said, that these misquotations of Scripture are trifling. Trifling as they may be, they ought not to have been made by one who reproves his brethren for want of proper respect to the exact and literal utterance of Scripture. On page 21, you say, "But take up that Book just as it reads, whole, unmutilated, unperverted; just as it was before irreverent hands began to tamper with it, and to shape it to human systems;" &c. And on page 20, speaking of your favorite doctrines, you say, "Can you get these doctrines away from the Bible, *except*

by altering and accommodating plain language; modifying here, and omitting there; explaining out some things, and explaining in others?" (the Italics are ours.) Would any one imagine, that, while writing these words, you were yourself "altering and accommodating; modifying here, and omitting there"? You quote a passage to prove Christ omnipotent, because he is said to have "all power in heaven and earth;" and prove it by omitting the words which show that all his power in heaven and earth is *derived*, and not independent power, — that is, all "given him" by God. You quote another passage to prove an atoning sacrifice by the cross of Christ, and do it by omitting the words which show that the enmity slain by the cross is that between Jew and Gentile, and not the enmity between man and God. To one who rebukes others for altering Scripture to make out an argument, and then, in a tract of forty-two small pages, makes at least *six* misquotations, — by two of them making out his argument, — we might say, "Cast the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

I am far from supposing, that, in thus misquoting Scripture, you had any intention to mislead. I merely suppose, that, in the heat and hurry of your purpose, you do not attend sufficiently to exactness of detail. We are all liable to this influence. Very likely, we have all done the same thing some time or other. But we ought to guard against it; for it cometh of evil. It is because, at the time, we are thinking more of an immediate purpose than we are thinking of the truth. Therefore it is best to keep each other careful, by pointing out, each to each, when we have thus failed of accuracy.

In the remainder of your tract, I see nothing important to be discussed, though much might be commented upon.

When you pity some of us for being embarrassed by "an inevitable association with others who go far beyond" us in denial, you seem to forget your own much closer association in the Episcopal Church with such writers as the authors of "Essays and Reviews." If we Unitarians, who profess no responsibility for each other's opinions, are under "a fearful responsibility" for those who agree with Theodore Parker, under how much more fearful a responsibility are not you for those in your church who sympathize with Oxford-Episcopal professors like Baden Powell and Benjamin Jowett!

You dwell as usual, in this tract, on the amount of outward works done by those who believe in the Trinity and kindred doctrines. They, you say, have done all the great and wonderful works which have been done in the Church. They have carried on "missions," and compassed sea and land with missionaries. They have organized "great churches," originated "great movements," accomplished "great reformations," &c.

True. But, what you say to us, the Roman Catholic says to you. If these arguments should induce us to join you, they should induce both you and us to go further, and become Roman Catholics; but, when the Romanists urge these arguments, you have an answer ready. You say, "Outward works by themselves, however great and astounding, are not enough to convince us of the truth of the doctrines from which they seem to proceed; for Jesus tells us, that, in the Day of Judgment, many will say, 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you.'" You say again, to the Romanist, "Missionary zeal cannot prove the truth of doctrine; for the Lord tells us

of those who compass sea and land to make one proselyte, who only make him worse, not better, after all." The Master always tells us that it is quality, not quantity, for which he asks, — two mites, given in the right spirit; one hour of faithful service; a little ointment, offered in grateful love. It is the spirit which vitalizes: the flesh profits nothing. The great body may be a dead body, as far as Christian life is concerned: the multitude of works may be dead works. The Lord is seldom in the whirlwind of excitement, or in the fire of heated feeling, but always in the still small voice of innermost conviction and purest personal love. It is not a "great" building which he asks us to build, but to build with right material; not with wood, hay, and stubble, but with gold, silver, and precious stones.

What is, then, the true spirit of Christ, which makes all works, great or small, to be truly good works? It is love, — love to God, and love to man. The *fear* of God may drive men to do a good many works; *conscience* may drag them to do many more: but it is only LOVE which can make them do what is really good. God wishes us to love him, and do for love whatever we do.

And, now, do you not know that many of these great and astounding works, which you so admire, are done by men who are driven to do them by the fear of everlasting punishment in hell? You yourself teach this doctrine. You teach the young men and young women under your charge, that the good God will damn to everlasting perdition all who are not converted in this world. This is the character which you ascribe to God. He is not a Being whose mercy endureth for ever; but he is a Being whose mercy endures only some seventy years or less. At the end of that time, if death catches you impenitent,

there is no more mercy left for you in the Divine Nature, — nothing but a certain fearful looking-for of judgment. The doctrines of the Church to which you so cordially invite us declare that no unconverted or unbelieving person, dying so, can possibly be saved, but that each goes to hopeless and never-ending suffering. They may be heathen, who have never heard of Christ; they may be heathen in our midst, educated from childhood to sin. No matter: if they die unconverted, the doctrines of your Church, and of all Orthodox churches, teach that God will damn them for ever. More than this, however you may shrink from saying it: your doctrines compel you to believe the same of all infants, dying before they could have an intelligent faith in Christ. They are born totally depraved; they cannot have been converted: consequently, they go to everlasting torment. Some of you, who believe in "regeneration by baptism," will make an exception in favor of baptized children; that is, you believe that God is a Being who will torment for ever all little children who die in infancy, except those whose parents happen to be Pedobaptists, and who, therefore, have had a little water put on their foreheads, with certain sacramental words.

These, Dr. Huntington, are the fatal heresies; for these, if believed, tend to destroy in the human soul that love of God which alone is salvation. No one can love an arbitrary, an unjust, or a cruel being. Every doctrine, then, which attributes such qualities to God, undermines the corner-stone of salvation. But now you ask us to "try" these views; to "treat them as if they were true;" to "go where they are held and proclaimed;" to "worship where they are the life and spirit of the worship." We reply, that we dare not do it. It is unsafe. We are afraid of risking our souls in that dark atmosphere. We are afraid

of losing our faith in our dear Father, and seeming to see in his place an arbitrary and vindictive Being. It may not always be so; but there is such a danger, and it is a vast one. I who write these lines have again and again heard with my ears the pathetic accounts of those whom Orthodoxy had driven from God, through long and dreary years. It was Orthodoxy which made them to live without hope and without God in the world. Let us trust, Dr. Huntington, that your religious education among Unitarians will save you from leading souls away into these fatal errors. Let us hope that you will not be logical enough to carry out your new belief into its legitimate conclusions.

We, meantime, indifferent to names and words, careless about the success or the failure of denominations, will cling to that article of the standing or falling Church, "justification by faith." We will still seek salvation, not by reliance on human works, but by trust in the infinite, unbought grace of the dear Father and Friend, who sent his only-begotten Son, not to condemn the world, but to save it. We will hold fast to the apostles' faith, that every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess Christ to be Lord, to the glory of God the Father. We will believe that all enemies shall be at last subdued under him; and that then the Son himself shall be subject to Him who did put all things under him, that God may be all in all. Believing thus in one God, and one Mediator between God and man, — the Man Christ Jesus, — we believe with the great host of the redeemed, on earth and in heaven.

I have written these things with great frankness, and have used much plainness of speech; but I hope I have not written with any "bitterness or partisanship:" if I have, I am sorry for it. And so, brother, farewell.

Yours in Christ, J. F. C.

CHARACTER OF NEGRO RACES.

[The following discriminating view of the negro character has been handed us for publication. It will probably be admitted to be true, in the main, by most observers.]

PHYSICALLY, negroes are of races differing as widely as those of the whites. Those of crooked spines, and shin-bones resembling a harness-collar, with baboon heads and faces, are patently inferior to others of quite a different structure; a difference that seems to have no necessary connection with color, but chiefly with organization. It is quite as noticeable as that between Irish, Yankee, and French. Inferiority of organization seems to be the basis and warrant of inferiority in other respects, rather than color.

This admitted, negroes can no more be spoken of as one people than the whites. At the South, — and especially in Virginia, for so many years the great breeding and trading State of the Union, so far as slaves are concerned,— this matter has been well understood, both in the household and at the auction-block. Those who share largely in the blood of the whites are preferred for the household and for trades, and command the highest market-prices. Still, is it not more a matter of organization than color? There are negroes of sootiest hue, erect and well-formed, and of good brain; and they are terrible as an army with banners.

The heart of the negro is larger than his head, if not larger than his body. His emotional nature is perhaps his most remarkable characteristic. In social life, it renders him affable, cheerful, and happy, where the lean and hungry Cassius would be still more lean and hungry. It makes them exceedingly gregarious; and disposes them to override moral and religious obligation, and come together in love, not exactly in the scriptural sense. They feel, more than they think.

They are predisposed to religious influences; and are easily moved to the faith and love of the gospel, even to its inmost experiences of faith, hope, and trust. They often come to visions, if not to unknown tongues. They sing all over, from head to heel; and the like in prayer. In seasons of religious interest, they are all aglow, like bees in swarming process. They create an aura in their churches, at such times, that is palpably felt by sensitive natures; and sinners must be fascinated, and succumb, or retreat.

Indeed, they seem endowed with peculiar religious receptivities; and God and good angels come nearer to their childlike natures, than to tallest thinkers and students, with their little cups of knowledge and worldly wisdom. I would rather risk my chance for the New Jerusalem, holding to the girdle of some negro saints I have known, who could neither read nor write, than with the sharpest exegesis and the best *creeded* theologian in the world. In his own way, God incarnates himself in the shepherd-son of Jesse, the babe of Bethlehem, and their like, as he does not at Cambridge or Andover or Oxford. At heaven's portal, I would greatly prefer certificates of stock in Brunswick Phœbe, New-Bedford Esther Wiggin, or even in the semi-fabulous Uncle Tom, than in Strauss, Schleusner, or Adam's Fall.

But this is the bright side, the God side, of the negro. He is hardly wise enough for many shares in this world and its goods, save as he takes them little by little, and day by day, from God's own palm, — much as the birds take their cup of seed where and when they find it, and sing just as merrily as though they knew where was another. Give us, day by day, our daily bread, is a part of the Lord's Prayer very dear to them.

They are more cosey than wise, more free and easy than

sharp. Their skins set more loosely than ours, and their bones and cartilages have freer play. The compliments of the day, and "Wah, wah," are almost ecstatic with them, — quite as much so as "Eureka" to the Greek or Yankee; but, while they are in this *quasi* paradise, some graceless Yankee pulls their little piece of land from under them, and some slavocrat chains their soft limbs, and they have nothing left of this world. Massa God and Massa Christ are their all-in-all, and they are rich indeed. I verily believe God will avenge them as he will no other people. If you would hear prayer to make your knees knock together, and your heart palpitate like a trip-hammer, go under the eaves of a slave-cabin at midnight; or near to one kneeling by a hill of corn, and hidden by its broad, green leaves arching over him; or even in the corner of a Virginian fence, — and you cannot but feel that troops of angels and God's own manifestations are there as seldom in church or cathedral. Contraband they may be in this low world; but alas for constitutions, frigates, and owners, in the next! On the other side of Jordan, Day and Martin will pass into other hands, if needed at all.

But I have been trying to present the unfavorable, not to say dark side; yet still am drawn to the traits that angels love. But there is a Providence that sometimes reveals itself in blind instincts and terrible impulses which we shudder to know, — the whirlwinds of the moral world. Such results of emotional and loving natures seem to be but God's taking into his own hands, and rendering very terrible, the cause of those who would not otherwise help themselves.

Secrecy, cunning, and trick are educational, if not innate. But these traits seem more like the claws of a cat, or the defensive odors of certain animals, than the

offspring of evil intent. They would be less than a feather's weight against the injustice and wholesale oppression of Illinois, and congressional and slave-state legislation and execution. On the whole, whatever is attempted on the dark side of negro character comes down on our white pates with stunning and staggering blows.

If a negro comes to me for aid, something whispers, "He cannot work on the public streets, because Irish politics better suit city authorities, and are more blind and less scrupulous. He cannot apprentice his children to any trade (barber's excepted), because of color-phobia. He cannot work in gangs, mills, or factories, for the same reason, or because his wool is not cotton-wool. He cannot enlist in the army, or join a white school or church in many places. In short, he can only love Dinah and the piccaninnies, play tricks, serve the Devil, beg, and be religious." I have made no mention of the ineffable oppression and nightmare of the heart to which he is continually subject among a people and in a country not his own. God help his little ones in this matter!

The negro heart, like the Capitol at Washington, has many broad avenues to it, while only narrow and crooked sheep-paths lead to his brain. But God seems to have compensated him for this deficiency by extraordinary instincts, which abundantly supply him with cunning, and with a short and broken wisdom of the serpent. If you would reach and move him, it must be through the heart; and, to this end, a red-flannel finger-ring would, with kindness, go as far as a blood-stone or an amethyst. A gay turban, and the cast-off dress of a white exquisite, with one meal per diem, might be preferred to three meals per diem without them.

A negro community would, I think, be a somewhat smooth and happy one. There would be enough of the

Devil in the same, in the shape of deception, trick, and idle hands, to obey impulses against *meum* and *tuum*, and to straighten woolly locks occasionally; to prevent stagnation and miasma; and enough of religion, at least, to make them as careless of the morrow as the birds of the air and the lilies of the field. I think they would know as much, if not more, of comfort and happiness, than a community of sharp-set and restless Yankees, and much more of the kingdom of God. Should I not prefer a community of negroes to one of Wall-street brokers, if forced to choose between them?

We do not wonder that the Southron is homesick if without the sphere of the negro. That sphere grows upon him through the traits described, and others that wait expression, as an infant does upon the home into which God sends it, until, in sickness or in health, it becomes the power that rules the house. Is it not this feeling, illy defined in some cases, and in others undistinguished from attachment to sagacious and faithful animals, that gives a half-honest conviction to some, that there is divinity in the institution of slavery?

Whether, in the evolutions of a Divine Providence, faith and love will ever hold the place with men they do with God, may be an open question; but, should such an age arrive, I sometimes dream that negro civilization will be atop of the world, and nearest to God, though now having its season in the wilderness. At any rate, looking to the great Assize, I doubt not that the race will have a friend at court who will present this bit of paper against me, if, intentionally, more or less than just to them.

Resolving the whole matter into the question, whether white or black has most of the childlike spirit, most of faith and love, and most of God in Christ, I should prophesy eventually the entire fading-out of the pale

faces and their civilization, so unjust and selfish, and the incoming of the heart's kingdom, which must belong to God and the blacks. Greater change than this would be the world has witnessed, and prophets quite as moon-struck as Yours truly, M. G. T.

LOOKING BACKWARD AND FORWARD.

To forget "what is behind," as Paul somewhere advises us, does not seem, at first sight, to be altogether a Christian duty. Is it not our duty to remember, rather than to forget; to look back to the past gratefully and penitently, — gratefully, remembering what we have received; penitently, remembering what we have omitted which we ought to have done? Is memory given us not to be used? or is not memory one of the most important faculties of the human soul?

But these questions are idle. The apostle who utters the words referred to takes it for granted that his hearers will make all proper limitation. Inspiration addresses itself to common sense, not to pedantry nor to verbal criticism. He does not mean to say, that one is *never* to look backward, — that we are always to forget, and to forget every thing: but he means to say, that we should not spend our life in looking backward; that it is the business of a Christian to look forward and to reach forward; to believe that the world will be better to-day than it was yesterday, and better to-morrow than it is to-day.

It is well often to remember; but it is well sometimes to forget. When the past hinders us, we had better forget it.

We must not dwell too much on our own past faults, errors, and sins: it is better to forget them sometimes. We must not dwell too much upon our past sufferings, disappointments, trials. We must not dwell too much on what we have seen of evil in others, or on the harm they have done to us.

Some persons seem to live in the memory of what is disagreeable. They recollect just the things they had better forget. They remember what is behind, and forget what is before. They walk backwards through the world. They are always talking of their losses, disappointments, trials, and sorrows. They demand the sympathy of the world for their amazing sufferings. They always assume the attitude of martyrs. All sorts of bodily sicknesses torment them. They feel injured if you think them well. Unheard-of diseases perplex them. I once knew a lady, who maintained that she had not been free from a violent headache, for a single moment, for thirty years; and another, who asserted that she had not slept a single minute during about the same time. The habit of telling such stories is like that of taking opium: you must constantly increase the dose. The story loses its stimulating power after a time, and a stronger one must be invented.

In like manner, other people love to remember the ill treatment they have received; and others enjoy the recollection of human baseness, selfishness, and sin in all its forms. They take a dark delight in the baseness and wickedness of mankind.

Now, it is better to forget these things which are behind. Constant fault-finding, constant recollection of evil suffered and evil witnessed, sours the temper, and takes the spring out of the will. Few companions are more disagreeable than those who croak, scold, find fault, and grumble. All men flee from them. Could they only forget the things

behind, what a blessed change would it be for themselves and others!

But it is still worse when practice is confirmed by theory. Bad practices do little harm, except when they are backed up by bad theories. Many people have a theory, that they ought to look back; and, indeed, that they ought to go back, rather than forward. There are four theories, which may be called (1) *The Stand-still Theory;* (2) *The Round-and-round Theory;* (3) *The Go-backward Theory;* (4) *The Go-forward Theory.* The first views life as stationary; has no faith in progress; believes neither in past nor in future; makes what it sees around it the standard for all things. This, it thinks, is being practical. This is the favorite theory of ignorance and indolence; opposing all improvement by a mere *vis inertiæ.* The second theory is more intellectual, though quite as discouraging. It is the theory of dead science. It asserts that every thing goes round and round, coming back to the same point; that progress in one place is balanced by retreat in another; that there is a loss compensating every gain. This theory is set forth most powerfully in the Book of Ecclesiastes, and is a doctrine of despair. Then there is the theory which regards all things as going backward; evil triumphing over good: the Devil is in the ascendency, and God defeated. It considers childhood better than youth; youth better than manhood; the first century better than the nineteenth; every thing old better than any thing new. Christianity abhors this theory; but the Church often accepts it. A portion of the Christian Church always thinks that the past days were better than these. They think that there were prophets once, but none now; inspiration once, but none at present; the old creeds true to a syllable, but no one capable of making a creed now. There is a class of Christians,

whose religion consists in the study of Christian antiquities, and who would carry the Church back to where it was about five hundred years ago. They hope to be saved by archæology. They cannot worship God, except in a Gothic church. True devotion requires that the psalms be intoned, so that no one can understand them; and he is a saint who can talk fluently, in the antiquated language of the thirteenth century, about church-matters.

All this is childish, but harmless; but there is a more injurious way of looking backward. Some think it a duty to dwell continually on their own past faults and sins. They think that true repentance requires them constantly to dwell upon the evil they have done. But looking at evil does not make us any better: only looking at good makes us better. The sight of evil may check us, when we are doing wrong: it may prevent us from growing worse; but it will not make us grow any better. The sight of evil may be a wholesome restraint, when we are going into error; but, as soon as we begin to go right, we need the sight of good. We must then forget the things behind, and reach out to those before.

The Christian theory of life is to LOOK FORWARD. It tells us that we are saved by hope. It flows naturally from a belief in God, — for a belief in God is a belief in good, — and in the superiority of good over evil. It is a belief in Divine Providence, guiding all events forward, in a kingdom of Christ; which will overcome all evil in a reign of love, which is to swallow up all hatred. This is Christianity: nothing else deserves the name.

LETTER FROM GANGOOLY.

Calcutta, Dec. 20, 1861.

Dear Mr. Clarke, — Mr. Phipson writes to the "Inquirer;" and I feel I should just send you a few lines to say what we have been doing since our last. The missionary work is progressing, and I have every hope of success. I have got a few regular inquirers, who come to me every Sunday; and we read the words of Jesus together, and hold what might be called a social service of "two or three gathered" in the name of our dear Master. We do not work in vain. As the result of our missionary labor, the Lord promises us a good harvest. Only a fortnight ago, I had the happiness of baptizing a young countryman of mine in the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost. It was very touching to me, who was idolatrous myself a few years ago, to convert one of my race to the knowledge of the true God. But let me be clear. I had not much to say to convince this young man. I only helped and encouraged him; for I saw that none but *Jesus* would he be satisfied with. His name is Womesh Bose. He belonged to the second caste, and leaves a young wife and two sons behind. Is it not a great sacrifice? Let us pray that God will bring those dear ones to him. He understands English well. You will know from the fact, that, in a book, he has written down verses of the New Testament, under appropriate heads; and numerous first-class writers and thinkers — such as Milton, Dryden, Young, &c. — appear in that book, with their extracts. His love for Jesus is more than what our Trinitarian brethren admit that a Unitarian cherishes. When he left home, and came out, he brought with him one suit of clothes (as most of us must do in India) and a "*picture.*" I had some curiosity

to see what sort of a picture it was; and what do you guess it was? — Jesus at the Supper! and our brother has pasted his words in the middle of the likeness. He is quite able to discuss with the Hindoos. The other day, in course of his conversation, he told the boys of Mr. Dall's school that they must have *religious education;* for it "*gives dignity to the soul.*"

Let me take this opportunity to explain an expression in my letter published in the "Journal" of September, which has been sadly misunderstood by two Medfield friends, and, I fear, by other readers of your "Journal." It was this: "On my arrival at home, a low-caste woman ran in, crying, 'Joguth!' and I immediately find myself encircled by the tender arms of my dear mother." My friends have understood by this that my mother was the "low-caste woman;" and, consequently, I have spoken great lies in styling myself as a Brahmin while in America. It did not strike me that it would convey such idea. The low-caste woman was a "*Moochee,*" or "a shoemaker," an elderly person, who was passing by our house, and, seeing me from a distance, "ran in, crying, 'Joguth!'" to inform my mother of my arrival; and before she had time to complete the sentence, "Joguth is come!" I find myself in the arms of my dear mother, who came out of the house to receive me as the "low-caste woman ran in." I boast not of our caste; yet I say, I belonged to the high caste. Only *yesterday,* a neighbor of my mother saluted me; forgetting that I have abdicated the position and caste of Brahmin, which my mother, brother, &c., still hold, and eagerly too.

The prejudice the nearest neighbor of my mother bore against me is getting slackened in a degree. The elderly women, who told horrible stories about my eating "*calf and hog*" and all unclean things, and would not touch me,

would now, for all that, be glad to stay with and hear me, if I talked for hours. In my last visit to Bally, I was requested by a couple of elderly women — one a Brahmin, and the other Caistus — to tell them something about the place I had been to. I prudently selected the subject, the condition of women in Christendom; their education; their privilege even to choose husbands; and the influence they shed in society. They were delighted with my narrative, and put many cross-questions; such as, if *all* the "*girls*" in America were good; if they loved their husbands; &c. Well, I reminded them of the Bengalee proverb: "There are moles even in heaven;" that there are many "rattle-brained" girls in America, who love gossip and playthings as well as any Heathen girl; but the *tendency* of the country *is upward;* and many there are whom I would that the women of my country should imitate.

The native Christians (Trinitarians) are very hostile to me, and they would have no communication with me. There is, however, one family where I am welcome in the capacity of a countryman, but not as a Christian. A little acquaintance has softened their prejudice; and the lady of the house wonders why I should not be called "Christian" as well as others. As this lady has seven children, I regard it a *treat* to drop in once in a fortnight.

If you do not feel tired, I shall tell you of an adventure in the Bishop's College. Here the family of the native clergyman was spending a few days; and I made them a visit, at their invitation. In the afternoon, some four ladies were sent for; and, when they came, we formed a social circle. All of them once belonged to Hindoo caste, but have come out with their husbands, and become Christians. It was gratifying to hear them ask me questions in *English.* Theology came in, and I satisfied them in the discussion;

for the Trinitarians erroneously think that we do not believe in Christ. The next day, my kind hostess took me to an officer of the college. He came to me, sat on a low stool, and peeling an orange, and putting the layers in his mouth, asked me the following, in a tone and look that might have frightened a lad: "Are you a Christian?" — "I am, sir." — "Do you believe in the Holy Trinity?" "I do not, sir." — "You are not a Christian, then." — "Sir, if the belief in the Trinity alone makes one a Christian, I am not one, I admit." — "Well, you do not believe Jesus 'the very God of very God.'" — "Beg your pardon, sir. What do you mean by 'very God of very God'?" — "Why, I mean 'supreme God' by that." — "I think 'very God' would do as well; but, sir, if you say 'very God of very God,' I should like to know who the other 'very God' is. You put two to show the superiority of the first over the second." Our brother made a rambling answer to this; and I was obliged, rather in my indiscretion, to say, "Sir, it seems to me that you do not understand what you say, but just quote the words of the creed." This pleased my hostess much. He, in his enthusiasm, wished another gentleman to convince me of the truth; so opened a Bible. "I am Alpha and Omega," &c., was brought in. Hearing that I have been a traveller, he wished me to come again; promising not to talk of religion. He asked my hostess how she got acquainted with me; and, in course of the conversation, triumphantly said, "Well, he does not belong to your order, but to mine." Thus you see, dear Mr. Clarke, the silly idea of the caste and order still lingers in the mind of the converts from the high caste.

Dec. 22. — To-day is the Lord's Day. As usual, I had my *little* congregation of five around me. We read and explained Matt. xi. 12. I applied the words of Jesus toward Bethsaida and Capernaum to Bengal; and his illus-

tration of the children in the market-place happily helped me to describe our parents, the Brahmins.

After the service, I was obliged to introduce the pastor of the Indiana-place Chapel, and our brother Mr. Winkley, to them, and read your remarks on the "Unitarian Chaplains," to the delight of all. Also made use of your illustration of willows growing downward. Do you remember you told us, in a sermon preached in Meadville, Pa., that we should not only *grow*, but grow *upward?* &c. Will not this lift your heart to God, that what you spoke to the congregation in Pennsylvania edifies the children of God in this far-off country?

I have told you, that I desire, with my whole heart, to serve the Association, for the spread of the dear faith we hold. I say now, that I am as strong in my affection for the work as ever. I have pledged myself before God and men to preach God and his Christ here in this land.

Very respectfully yours, J. C. GANGOOLY.

WAR'S HURRICANE, WITH A CALM AT ITS CENTRE.

(A Poem read at a meeting of a church, one of whose members was going to teach the emancipated slaves at Port Royal.)

FAR to the South, where Tropic Ocean smiles,
In fadeless beauty bloom a hundred isles.
O lovely bowers, sweet gardens of the deep!
O fair Antilles, lapped in dreamless sleep!
Like battle-ships in one vast crescent moored,
Anchored afar to windward and to leeward,
Stretched on the palpitating sea away,
A vast armada, to defend the bay.

Yet o'er that scene what fearful change shall go, —
Change, of all things the unchanging thing below!
Born out of awful stillness, black as night,
Comes the tornado with terrific might:
The glassy seas in foamy mountains rise,
And lurid darkness fills the noonday skies.
Over a thousand miles of land and deep,
The great tornado, in its dreadful sweep,
Whirls round its orbit on tempestuous wings,
And in enormous circles onward swings;
Whirls round one centre in its stormy play,
Takes that calm centre forward on its way,
Some peaceful leagues within the stormy main, —
Peace, in the bosom of a hurricane.

So slept these States in confident repose,
Trusting themselves, despising human foes;
So slept our Union, confident and vain;
So on its slumbers burst the hurricane;
In self-relying confidence and pride,
It spurned God's justice, and man's rights defied;
Hardening its heart like Egypt's Pharaoh,
When God commanded, "Let my people go;"
Sending the slave to hopeless bondage back;
Thinking that, like itself, GOD hated black, —
Now takes its penalty just where it sinned,
And reaps the whirlwind where it sowed the wind.
In one dread hour the fierce tornado came,
And all our proud Republic feels the shame.

But yet, as o'er the land the tempest rolls,
And War's terrific judgment tries men's souls,
This storm of battle bears within its breast
One blessed spot of Christian peace and rest, —
The holy Charity, whose footstep brave
Follows Destruction's path to heal and save;
Prays by the dying, soothes the closing eye
With looks of tenderness and sympathy;

And, all-forgetful if of friend or foe,
Thinks only how to assuage the sufferer's woe; —
These blessed actions show to us again
The peaceful centre of the hurricane.

And now that dungeon portal, bolted fast,
Shaken by War's dread earthquake, falls at last.
God's poor, so long shut down in starless night,
Open their timid eyes, and ask for light.
Christ's coming rends again the prisons walls,
And through the yawning chinks God's sunlight falls.
Shall not the Master's servants hear the cry?
Shall they not send his truth to those who lie
In that dark shadow of despair and death, —
His truth, to quicken each reviving breath?
Shall not four million slaves at last be heard,
And lift their thanks for God's triumphant Word?

Some of our friends have nobly gone to fight
In the great cause of Liberty and Right;
Others have gone, with tender touch and tread,
To hover round the wounded soldiers' bed.
Go thou, my friend, to yet another place;
To pay our debt to that oppressèd race:
Through you, New England to the Negro sends
Her special gift, of light; with you, she lends
To him her choicest culture, tenderest love;
For this the law sung by God's hosts above, —
Let the best love unto the lowliest go,
The highest comfort to the deepest woe,
The purest light shine in the darkest place,
Earth's noblest culture aid the humblest race:
For God came down in Christ to seek and save
The beggar, sinner, publican, and slave.

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Feb. 10, 1862. — Present, Messrs. Hedge, Emerson, Lincoln, C. W. Clark, J. F. Clarke, Brigham, Barrett, Stebbins, Hinckley, Sawyer, and Fox.

The Committee on New-England Correspondence presented applications for aid, — from Rev. Dr. Wheeler's society, in Brunswick, Me.; and from the society in East Marshfield, Mass.: but, for want of funds, their consideration was postponed until some future meeting.

Some time was then spent in hearing reports from the different members of the Board, concerning the responses received by them to the circulars sent to parishes and pastors.

Rev. J. F. Clarke, who was requested at the last meeting to write to Mr. Daniel Low in reference to the $1,000 contributed by him for a printing-press for the India Mission, reported that he had addressed Mr. Low on the subject as instructed, informing him, that, as it did not seem expedient to purchase a press, the money was held by the Treasurer, subject to his order; but suggesting that it could be very usefully employed for the support of Mr. Dall's Mission School. Mr. Low had replied, that he would give the $1,000 for the purpose referred to, on condition that within thirty days there should be collected, from parties not in the regular subscription-list of the Association, $400 additional for the same object. The Board decided that an effort ought to be made to raise this sum; and a Committee was appointed to make the attempt.

Several other matters of importance were considered, and acted upon; and, after a session of nearly three hours, the meeting was adjourned.

INTELLIGENCE.

Rev. George W. Bartlett, formerly pastor of the Unitarian Society in Augusta, Me., has gone to Ship Island as chaplain of the Thirteenth Maine Regiment.

Rev. Thomas T. Stone, of Bolton, has been invited to take charge of the society in Sandwich, Mass., for three months.

Mr. John B. Green, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School in the class of 1861, was ordained as pastor of the society in Bernardston, Mass., on Wednesday, Feb. 5. The order of services was as follows: Anthem; introductory prayer, by Rev. J. K. Hosmer, of Deerfield; selections from the Scriptures, by Rev. William O. White, of Keene, N.H.; original hymn; sermon, by Rev. William P. Tilden, of Fitchburg; ordaining prayer, by Rev. William Silsbee, of Northampton; hymn; charge, by Rev. D. H. Ranney, of West Brattleborough, Vt.; right hand of fellowship, by Rev. John Murray, of Northfield; anthem, "And it shall come to pass;" address to the people, by Rev. John F. Moors, of Greenfield; concluding prayer, by Rev. Preserved Smith, of Deerfield; doxology; benediction, by the pastor.

Mr. James De Normandie, of the Senior Class in the Cambridge Divinity School, has received a call from the society in Portsmouth, N.H.

Rev. Daniel W. Stevens, in order to devote attention to educational pursuits, will dissolve his connection with the Unitarian Society at Mansfield, Mass., the 1st of April next, after a pastorate of twelve years.

Mr. James T. Hewes, a graduate of the Cambridge Divinity School in the class of 1861, was ordained as pastor of the Hawes-place Society, South Boston, on Wednesday evening, Feb. 19. The order of services was as follows: Anthem; introductory prayer, by Rev. A. S. Ryder, of South Boston;

selections from the Scriptures, by Rev. Henry W. Foote, of King's Chapel, Boston; hymn; sermon, by Rev. Horatio Stebbins, of Portland, Me.; prayer of ordination, by Rev. John T. G. Nichols, of Saco, Me.; hymn; charge and address to the society, by Rev. Edward E. Hale, of South Congregational Church, Boston; fellowship of the churches, by Rev. Samuel C. Beane, of Chicopee; anthem; concluding prayer, by Rev. John S. Cantwell, pastor of the Universalist Society in South Boston; hymn; benediction, by the pastor.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Since our last Notice.

The True Story of the Barons of the South; or, The Rationale of the American Conflict. By E. W. Reynolds, author of "The Records of Bubbleton Parish," &c. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co., 245, Washington Street. 1862.

This handsome volume of 240 pages is devoted to a discussion of the causes of the rebellion at the South; which causes it finds in the "irrepressible conflict" between slavery and freedom. The "Barons of the South" is a phrase given to the slaveholders by John Adams, and is used as showing the aristocratic nature of slavery. We think that this volume, from its research, its facts, its arguments, and the correctness of its views, deserves a place in the antislavery library, beside the works of Channing, Parker, Horace Mann, John G. Palfrey, and others.

Christian Worship. Services for the Church, with Order of Vespers and Hymns. New York: James Miller, 522, Broadway. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co. 1862.

The outside aspect of this book makes it the most attractive of all our service-books. It is a luxury to read in it, so distinct and neat is the typography. The selections are apparently well made; and certainly the whole work gives evidence of the most elaborate and careful preparation. The fault which will be found with it is that it is *too* elaborate. Many will unquestionably find it too formal, too prescriptive, too methodical and regular. They will ask, "What good reason is there for the multiform repetitions, the doxologies over and over again, or for having precisely these psalms and songs on the first

Sunday in the month, those on the second, and so on for ever? May it not often happen that the psalms which we wish to read on the first Sunday may be appointed for the second? And why should these particular hymns, and no others, be sung on each day? When we find ourselves compelled to sing some one hymn, shall we not immediately wish, for that very reason, to sing a different one? Why is it desirable that the Commandments be read once a month, no more nor less?"

These are questions which suggest themselves. We fear that this liturgy fails (for use among Unitarians) in an excess of regularity. Nevertheless, if we were about to adopt or to experiment with a liturgy, we might select this, with the understanding that we should read from it, *not* according to the prescribed order, but in any way we thought best at the time. It is a very attractive and beautiful book.

Some kind of *service-book* there should be in every religious society. Each church should have its service-book, to be used more or less, as the people prefer. But there should be a service-book to each church, as a means of guiding the thoughts of the young, as a book of devotions, as a companion in journeys, as a gift to those going away, as a bond of church union, as an element in church life. The KING'S-CHAPEL SOCIETY, in Boston, has been held together for years, in a great degree, by its service-book.

We are grateful to our brethren, Osgood and Farley, for their labors on this book; and hope it will do all they expect from it.

Tracts for Priest and People. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co., 245, Washington Street, Boston.

This is a look at "Essays and Reviews" from the point of view of the Rev. F. D. Maurice and his friends. They cannot sympathize with the spirit or the opinions of "Essays and Reviews," nor with the spirit and opinions of the English bishops and others who have replied to that remarkable theological firebrand.

We must say, that, after much reading of the writings of Maurice, we find it hard to say what single thing he has ever distinctly uttered. His voice is always heard whenever any thing is going on in the religious world. He always comes forth like a judge about to settle the whole question with one decisive word. He always condemns those on both sides in every dispute. But, though he speaks with immense energy, it is always in a most inarticulate way. His mind wants defining power. He talks *about* a subject, never *to* it. He cannot aim a point-blank shot at any thing. The difficulty is, that Mr. Maurice speaks before he has any thing to say. Deeply imbued with ideas, he feels the divergence of those ideas from the usual course of thought; but he has never learned how to explain wherein the

divergence consists. Therefore, though his purpose is excellent and his spirit good, the result of his speech is always small.

To illustrate and defend this rather hard judgment on Mr. Maurice, let us look at his article in this volume, page 289, called "Morality and Divinity." The subject is a dispute, between the Bishop of Oxford and an Oxford layman, about creeds. The bishop wishes to put down all doubt of the creeds: the layman maintains that Christ's Sermon on the Mount is the best possible creed. What does Mr. Maurice say about it?

1. He says the layman is right in recalling the attention of clergymen to the statements in the Sermon on the Mount, especially at the end. The clergy need to be thus reminded of it. So far, the layman is right. But the layman is wrong in opposing creeds; for the practical Christianity in the Sermon on the Mount somehow needs the doctrine of the Trinity, as set forth in the creeds, to make it effectual. But this doctrine of the Trinity must not be treated as a doctrine, but as a life in the Father, Son, and Spirit.

2. The creeds are now defended by the bishop and others as "authoritative declarations of faith." This will not do at all. We need something more than interior experiences; we need something solid and objective to rest on: but it must not be a "terminology." The Trinity must not be regarded as a dogma, but as an announcement of a Divine Triplicity, — as a *living* Father, Son, and Spirit.

3. If the creed is thus held, not as containing authoritative dogmas, but as testifying to a living God in Trinity of manifestation, then the following good results will come: —

(1) Divinity will not be separated from morality.

(2) There will not be two moralities.

(3) No hostility between subjective and objective religion.

(4) We shall not crush our doubts, but bring them to the light.

(5) We shall not oppose nature and grace.

(6) We shall end the war between the creeds and the Bible.

(7) We shall know what to concede for the sake of peace.

(8) We shall know how to be liberal.

(9) We shall not condemn those who do not believe the Athanasian Creed.

(10) We shall know how the Church of England is a compromise, and how not.

It will be seen that Mr. Maurice fails here, as usual, by not clearly defining his main position. We cannot tell exactly what his distinction is between the good and bad use of creeds. He seems somewhat wanting in analytic power.

We have only found fault, thus far, with this volume; but it deserves a great deal of commendation, for which we have no space. We must, therefore, leave this for another time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1862.

Jan. 29.	From	Society in Marblehead, for Monthly Journals .	$4.00
„ 30.	„	Society in North Easton, for Monthly Journals	10.00
„ 31.	„	Society in Neponset, through Rev. F. W. Holland, for Monthly Journals	15.00
Feb. 1.	„	Society in Deerfield, for Monthly Journals . .	7.00
„ „	„	Society in Harvard, for Monthly Journals . .	6.00
„ 3.	„	Society in New Bedford, for Monthly Journals	39.00
„ „	„	Mrs. Martin Bates, to make herself a life-member	30.00
„ 4.	„	Society in Shirley, for Monthly Journals . .	7.00
„ 5.	„	Mr. H. H. Soule, as a donation	4.00
„ 6.	„	Society in Syracuse, N.Y., for Monthly Journals	20.00
„ 7.	„	Rev. Calvin Lincoln's Society, Hingham, for Monthly Journals	9.00
„ „	„	Society in Scituate, for Monthly Journals . .	7.00
„ 8.	„	Society in Watertown, for Monthly Journals .	20.00
„ 11.	„	Society in Walpole, Mass., for Monthly Journals for years 1860–61	20.00
„ 12.	„	Society in Deerfield, for Monthly Journals, additional	9.00
„ 14.	„	Society in Nashua, N.H., for Monthly Journals	14.00
„ 17.	„	Rev. Nathaniel Hall's Society, Dorchester, for Monthly Journals	46.00
„ 18.	„	Rev. Dr. Robbins's Society, Boston, as a donation	131.15
„ „	„	Society in Waltham, for Monthly Journals . .	33.00
„ 19.	„	Mount-Pleasant Society, Roxbury, for Monthly Journals	23.00
„ 21.	„	Rev. F. A. Farley, D.D., trustee, as interest on Graham Fund	87.50
„ 24.	„	Rev. Dr. Newell's Society, Cambridge, as a donation	100.00
„ „	„	Miss L. E. Penhallow, as fourth payment on life-membership	5.00
„ „	„	Society in Scituate, for Monthly Journals, additional	2.00

ARMY FUND.

	Amount already acknowledged	$1,257.37
Feb. 8.	From Rev. James F. Clarke's Society, Boston . . .	54.00
		$1,311.37

CANDIDATES FOR SETTLEMENT.

This list will be corrected monthly. Brethren desiring their names entered, or address changed, will please indicate the same to the Secretary of the A. U. A.

The * affixed to the word "Boston" indicates the address, — "Care of American Unitarian Association, Boston."

Preachers.	Address.
Horatio Alger, Jr.	Cambridge.
John B. Beach	Meadville, Penn.
La Fayette Bushnell, care of "Christian Inquirer,"	New York.
F. L. Capen . . . Care of Barnard Capen, Esq.	Boston.
William Cushing	Clinton.
J. H. Fowler	Cambridge.
Merritt E. Goddard	Cambridge.
J. L. Hatch	Boston.*
John W. Hudson	Springfield.
Lyman Maynard	Milford, Mass.
John Orrell	Boston.*
George Osgood	Kensington, N.H.
J. M. Peirce	Cambridge.
Thomas H. Pons	Boston.*
D. H. Ranney	W. Brattleboro', Vt.
James Richardson	Boston.*
Charles Robinson	Groton.
Ed. G. Russell	Cambridge.
George W. Stacy	Milford.
Livingston Stone	Cambridgeport.
L. G. Ware	Boston.*
Daniel S. Whitney	Southborough.
J. Henry Wiggin	Montague.
George A. Williams	Deerfield.
Martin W. Willis	Nashua, N.H.
Samuel D. Worden	Lowell.
William C. Wyman	Brooklyn, N.Y.
J. C. Zachos	Cincinnati, O.